	Application No.			Applicant(s)	
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summa	ary	09/820,684	,	KITAGAWA, NOBUHIRO	
		Examiner	,	Art Unit	
		Brian R. Gordon		1743	
All Participants:		Status of Application	on:	_	
(1) <u>Brian R. Gordon</u> .		(3)			
(2) Richard Gallahger.		(4)			
Date of Interview: 2 June 2004		Time:			
Type of Interview:  ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant  Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes If Yes, provide a brief description:		ant's representative)			
Part I.					
Rejection(s) discussed: 112, secnond paragraph rejection of claim 1					
Claims discussed: 1 and 12					
Prior art documents discussed: none					
Part II.					
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE See Continuation Sheet	E GENE	RAL NATURE OF WHAT	T WAS D	)ISCUSSED:	
Part III.					
<ul> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a set directly resulted in the allowance of the application of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.</li> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a set did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief</li> </ul>	ation. The eparate r	e examiner will provide a record of the substance	a written of the in	summary of the terview, since	he substance
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (A	Applicant	/Applicant's Representat	tive Sign	ature – if appro	opriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: In effort to expedite the allowance of the claims, the examiner placed a called to applicant on 5-24-04. The examiner informed applicant that claim 1 was primarily amended as suggested by the examiner in the final office action 2-24-04. However, the suggested amendment to clarify the "suitable operational position" was excluded by applicant and new broader independent claim (12) was added. The examiner invited applicant to make the previously proposed amendment to clarify the phrase and cancel new claim 12, which may be persued in a separate application, in order to allow the remaining claims. Mr. Gallahger indicated he would contact applicant with proposed solutions and contact the examiner with a decision. Due to the lack of a response, the examiner once again contacted Mr. Gallahger on 6-2-04 to see if a decision had been made. Mr Gallagher did not indicate a decision had been made and said perhaps applicant intend to pursue the new in the instant application. The examiner informed applicant that the amendment would not be entered and an advisory action would be issued.